

1 FRANCIS O. SCARPULLA (CASB No. 41059)  
2 PATRICK B. CLAYTON (CASB No. 240191)  
3 LAW OFFICES OF FRANCIS O. SCARPULLA  
4 456 Montgomery Street, 17<sup>th</sup> Floor  
5 San Francisco, CA 94111  
6 Telephone: (415) 788-7210  
7 Facsimile: (415) 788-0706  
8 [fos@scarpullalaw.com](mailto:fos@scarpullalaw.com)  
9 [pbc@scarpullalaw.com](mailto:pbc@scarpullalaw.com)

10 JOSEF D. COOPER (CASB No. 53015)  
11 TRACY R. KIRKHAM (CASB No. 69912)  
12 JOHN D. BOGDANOV (CASB No. 215830)  
13 COOPER & KIRKHAM, P.C.  
14 357 Tehama Street, Second Floor  
15 San Francisco, CA 94103  
16 Telephone: (415) 788-3030  
17 Facsimile: (415) 882-7040  
18 [jdc@coopkirk.com](mailto:jdc@coopkirk.com)  
19 [trk@coopkirk.com](mailto:trk@coopkirk.com)  
20 [jdb@coopkirk.com](mailto:jdb@coopkirk.com)

21 *Counsel for Indirect-Purchaser Plaintiffs*

22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
**NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**  
**SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION**

In re: CATHODE RAY TUBE (CRT)  
ANTITRUST LITIGATION.

Master File No. 3:07-cv-5944 JST

MDL No. 1917

This Document Relates to:  
All Indirect-Purchaser Actions.

**DECLARATION OF FRANCIS O.  
SCARPULLA IN SUPPORT OF MOTION  
RE: APPOINTMENT OF CO-LEAD  
CLASS COUNSEL FOR INDIRECT-  
PURCHASER PLAINTIFFS WITH  
CLAIMS IN NON-REPEALER STATES**

SCARPULLA DECL. ISO MOTION RE:  
APPOINTMENT OF CO-LEAD CLASS COUNSEL  
FOR IPP W/ CLAIMS IN NON-REPEALER  
STATES

Master File No. 3:07-cv-5944 JST  
MDL 1917

1 I, Francis O. Scarpulla, declare as follows:

2 1. I am an attorney duly licensed by the State of California and am admitted to  
3 practice before this Court. I am the sole owner of the Law Offices of Francis O. Scarpulla  
4 (“Scarpulla Firm”) and my firm, along with others, serves as attorneys of record for the Indirect  
5 Purchaser Plaintiffs in this MDL proceeding. If called upon and sworn as a witness, I could  
6 competently testify regarding them. I make this declaration pursuant to Title 28 United States  
7 Code, Section 1746.

8 2. This litigation involves an alleged price-fixing conspiracy to raise prices of  
9 Cathode Ray Tubes used in TVs and computer monitors sold throughout the United States.

10 3. Settlements with all remaining defendants are pending before this Court.  
11 Consumers with claims in 22 so-called “*Illinois Brick* Repealer” states may receive monetary  
12 recovery if these settlements are approved. Although the settlements release all claims that  
13 consumers may have in the so-called non-repealer states, no consideration of any kind is being  
14 given to any of those consumer class members. Lead Counsel claims that is permissible because  
15 none of these consumers has a viable claim for relief. Because Lead Counsel has abandoned these  
16 consumers, the undersigned, along with Josef D. Cooper of Cooper & Kirkham, respectfully  
17 request that this Court appoint them Co-Lead Counsel to represent all consumers with claims in  
18 the non-repealer states.

19 4. My firm has sufficient liquid assets to finance the representation of the abandoned  
20 class members, and I am prepared to devote the necessary time to representation of such class  
21 members.

22 5. Attached hereto as Exhibit A is a true and correct copy of my curriculum vitae.

23 6. While I am reluctant to engage in self-adulation, as indicated in my C.V., I have  
24 had more experience in prosecuting – and settling – indirect-purchaser, antitrust class actions than  
25 any other lawyer in the nation. I developed the case law-precedent of statewide antitrust class  
26 actions brought in the so-called “*Illinois Brick* repealer” states – first in various state courts and,

1 after the Congress passed the Class Action Fairness Act, in federal courts. I have participated in  
 2 the leadership of over 150 indirect-purchaser class actions, most of which I settled. Additionally, I  
 3 have tried as the lead trial counsel six complex cases to juries. I have argued numerous class  
 4 certification motions and summary judgment motions. I have taken and/or defended hundreds of  
 5 depositions in antitrust and other complex cases.

6 7. I am admitted to practice before the United States Supreme Court, and various  
 7 United States Courts of Appeal and United States District Courts. I am also admitted to practice  
 8 before the California Supreme Court and all inferior courts of that state. I have been admitted to  
 9 the Rolls of Solicitors in the United Kingdom since 2010.

10 8. I have received the following professional accolades:

- 11 • AV and AV Preeminent Lawyer in Martindale for over 30 years;
- 12 • Antitrust Lawyer of the Year Award by the California State Bar Antitrust  
 13 Section for 2005;
- 14 • California Super Lawyers, each year from 2009-2015;
- 15 • *California Lawyer* Attorney [Antitrust] of the Year – CLAY Award 2013;
- 16 • Chambers & Partners, USA Band-1 for Plaintiffs' Antitrust Attorneys  
 17 2013-2015;
- 18 • Top 100 Lawyers in California by the *Daily Journal*;
- 19 • Titan of the Bar by Law360;
- 20 • Best Lawyers in America 2015.

21 I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the  
 22 foregoing is true and correct. Executed this 11<sup>th</sup> day of December, 2015, in San Francisco,  
 23 California.

24  
 25 /s/ Francis O. Scarpulla  
 Francis O. Scarpulla

# EXHIBIT A

**CURRICULUM VITAE OF FRANCIS O. SCARPULLA**

Mr. Scarpulla specializes in prosecuting complex civil cases, primarily antitrust lawsuits, most of which are class actions.

Upon graduation from Hastings School of Law in June 1967, Mr. Scarpulla became an associate in the Law Offices of Joseph L. Alioto with responsibilities for the preparation of complex civil antitrust cases. In November 1970, Mr. Scarpulla formed his own firm and continued prosecuting complex civil cases, representing plaintiffs in antitrust lawsuits, many of which were class actions. In June 2006, Mr. Scarpulla joined the firm of Zelle Hofmann Voelbel & Mason as a senior partner and led that firm's antitrust practice until March 2015, when Mr. Scarpulla returned to his original firm.

Mr. Scarpulla has participated in many federal antitrust class actions which have served to develop both state and federal law. The federal antitrust class actions include the *Gypsum Wallboard Antitrust Litigation*, *Sugar Antitrust Litigation*, *Folding Cartons Antitrust Litigation*, *Fine Paper Antitrust Litigation*, *Corrugated Container Antitrust Litigation*, *Pharmaceutical Antitrust Litigation*, *Microsoft Monopolization Antitrust Litigation*, *Cosmetics Antitrust Litigation*, and more recently in the *DRAM*, *SRAM*, and *LCD MDL* cases. Mr. Scarpulla and his firm participated as lead counsel in many class actions in California, including those which developed the law involving state-court antitrust jurisdiction (*St. Joe Paper Company v. Superior Court* (1981) 120 Cal.App.3d 991, 175 Cal.Rptr. 94); joinder of parties and fraudulent concealment (*Union Carbide Corporation v. Superior Court* (1984) 36 Cal.3d 15, 201 Cal.Rptr. 580, 679 P.2d 14); federal pre-emption policies (*Crown Oil Corporation v. Superior Court* (1986) 177 Cal.App.3d 604, 223 Cal.Rptr. 164, *re-hearing denied*, March 13, 1986, *hearing denied*, May 22, 1986, *U.S. S.Ct. appeal dismissed*, October 14, 1986); and the propriety of class action certification in such actions (*B.W.I. Custom Kitchen v. Owens-Illinois, Inc.* (1987) 191 Cal.App.3d 1341, 235 Cal.Rptr. 228, *re-hearing denied*, March 30, 1987, *hearing denied*, July 2, 1987, *request for depublication denied*, July 20, 1987).

In addition to practicing law, Mr. Scarpulla was the past Chair of the Antitrust and Trade Regulation Section of the California State Bar. He has participated in both ABA and CEB panels on competitive business practices, as well as having served as a guest lecturer in MBA programs. Mr. Scarpulla was also an instructor at The University of California Hastings School

of Law, teaching legal writing classes during 1985 and 1988. He was an adjunct professor of Antitrust Law at Golden Gate University Law School. He was invited to teach Antitrust Law at The University of San Francisco School of Law during the fall of 2015. In addition to having an “AV” rating in *Martindale* for the past 30 years, Mr. Scarpulla is now rated “AV Preeminent” in *Martindale*. Mr. Scarpulla is on the approved list of mediators for the Northern District of California, the State Bar of California, and the San Francisco Bar Association. Mr. Scarpulla was nominated by fellow lawyers to the *Best Lawyers in America* listing. He was one of the authors of the California State Bar's publication *California Antitrust Law*, writing the section on indirect-purchaser class actions, and a co-author on the LexisNexis publication *California Class Actions and Procedures*. Mr. Scarpulla authored a chapter on “Aggression in Mediation” for the treatise published by the International Bar Association entitled “Mediation Techniques.” Mr. Scarpulla was named “Antitrust Lawyer of the Year” for 2005 by the Antitrust Section of the California State Bar. In 2010, Mr. Scarpulla was admitted to the Rolls of Solicitors in the United Kingdom. Mr. Scarpulla has been named a “Super Lawyer” in California for several years, including 2009, 2010, 2011, 2012, 2013, and 2014. In 2014, Mr. Scarpulla was named a Tier 1 plaintiffs antitrust attorney by Chambers & Partners U.S.A. He was named one of the Top 100 Lawyers in California by the Daily Journal in 2012.

For a detailed list of cases in which Mr. Scarpulla has participated, see the attached Appendix 1.

Articles & Presentations

“[Plaintiffs’ strategies for pursuing private damage claims](#),” 2010 International Cartel Workshop, Paris, February 10-12, 2010, panelist.

[California State Antitrust & Unfair Competition Law](#), 2009, co-author.

“[B.W.I., California’s Favorable Class Action Jurisprudence, and Their Post-CAFA Application](#),” *Competition*, Vol. 17, No. 2, Fall 2008, co-author.

*California Class Actions and Procedures* (LexisNexis), co-author.

*California Antitrust Law* (California State Bar publication), co-author.

“Thinking Globally About Recovery Actions in International Cartel Cases – A U.S. Perspective,” paper for Oxford Centre for Competition Law and Policy: The Antitrust Enforcement Symposium, Pembroke College, Oxford, United Kingdom, June 28-29, 2014, co-author, pending publication by Oxford University Press.

BAR AND COURT ADMISSIONS

- United States Supreme Court
- United States Circuit Courts of Appeals for the Fifth, Seventh and Ninth Circuits
- United States District Courts: Northern, Central, and Eastern Districts of California; Northern District of Illinois; Eastern District of Pennsylvania
- Supreme Court and all inferior courts of the State of California
- Solicitor, United Kingdom

**APPENDIX**

**COMPLEX LITIGATION CASES**

- (1) *Plumbing Fixtures Antitrust Litigation* (E.D. Pa.) – price-fixing case brought on behalf of classes of public bodies and various private clients. *See Lindy Bros. v. American Radiator & Standard Sanitary Corp.*, 487 F.2d 161 (3<sup>rd</sup> Cir. 1973).
- (2) *Asphalt Antitrust Litigation* (N.D. Cal., D. New Mex., D. Idaho, D. Colo.) – price-fixing case brought on behalf of various public bodies. *See State of New Mexico v. American Petrofina, et al.*, 501 F.2d 363 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1974).
- (3) *Newspaper Publishing Monopolization Litigation* (N.D. Cal.) – brought on behalf of competing newspaper. *See San Francisco Bay Guardian v. San Francisco Chronicle, et al.*, 344 F.Supp. 1155 (N.D. Cal. 1972).
- (4) *Gypsum Wallboard Antitrust Litigation* (N.D. Cal.) – price-fixing case brought on behalf of a national class of governmental bodies. *See In re: Gypsum Cases*, 1974-2 Trade Cases &74,272 (N.D. Cal. 1974).
- (5) *Albacore Monopolization Litigation* (N.D. Cal.) – Sherman 1 and 2 case brought on behalf of a class of albacore fishermen. *See Western Fishboat Owners Association v. Castle & Cooke, Inc., et al.*, C-74-1784 (N.D. Cal. 1974).
- (6) *Processed Potato Price Fixing Litigation* (S.D. Cal.) – brought on behalf of a class of restaurants. *See Love's Wood Pit Barbecue v. Bell Brand Foods, Inc., et al.*, 1974 Trade Cases &74,905 (S.D. Cal. 1974).
- (7) *Boise City, Idaho v. Monroe, Inc., et al.*, Civil Action No. 1-76-127 (D. Idaho) – price-fixing action brought on behalf of the municipality of Boise City, Idaho, against certain ready-mix concrete companies.
- (8) *In re: Arizona Bakery Products Litigation*, Civil No. 74-208A PHX CAM (D. Ariz.) – antitrust price-fixing action brought on behalf of five classes of Arizona purchasers of bakery products.
- (9) *Spinetti, et al. v. Atlantic Richfield Company*, C-75-0324-RFP (N.D. Cal.) – claims of 80 petroleum wholesale distributors against their suppliers for violations of antitrust and federal energy laws.
- (10) *Presidio Golf Club of San Francisco, Inc., et al. v. National Service Industries, Inc.*, C-71-945-SW (N.D. Cal.) – price-fixing action brought on behalf of class of linen service users against linen suppliers.
- (11) *In re: Arizona Dairy Products Litigation*, Civil No. 74-569A PHX CAM (D. Ariz.) – antitrust price-fixing action brought on behalf of five classes of Arizona purchasers of dairy products.



- (12) *Folding Cartons Antitrust Litigation*, MDL 250 (N.D. Ill.) – antitrust price-fixing action brought on behalf of direct purchaser nationwide class of folding carton users.
- (13) *In re: Hawaii Beer Litigation*, Civil No. 77-0294A (D. Ha.) – antitrust price-fixing class action brought on behalf of a class of purchasers of beer in the State of Hawaii.
- (14) *In re: Sugar Industry Antitrust Litigation*, MDL 201 (N.D. Cal.) – antitrust price-fixing action brought on behalf of three private classes of sugar purchasers in the Western United States.
- (15) *Danielson v. Union Oil Company of California* (N.D. Cal.) – brought by petroleum wholesale distributor against his supplier for violation of federal antitrust and energy laws.
- (16) *Boardwalk Markets, Inc., et al. v. Associated Foods Stores, et al.* (N.D. Cal.) – brought by minority shareholders in wholesale grocery cooperative alleging violations of federal securities laws.
- (17) *National Super Spuds v. Gearhart Farms, Inc., et al.* (S.D. N.Y.) – commodities futures fraud action alleging manipulation of May 1976 Maine Potato Futures Contract.
- (18) *Fine Paper Antitrust Litigation (State of Arizona v. Boise Cascade, et al.)*, MDL 235 – antitrust price-fixing action by state agencies who purchased fine paper products.
- (19) *In re: California Armored Cars Litigation*, MDL 387 – antitrust price-fixing action brought on behalf of private class of purchasers in California.
- (20) *Busy Boy Markets, Inc., et al. v. A.R.A. Services, Inc., et al.*, Civil Action No. C-79-2156-SW (N.D. Cal. 1980) – antitrust price-fixing action brought on behalf of purchasers of publications.
- (21) *In re: California Wiring Devices Antitrust Litigation*, Civil Action No. 759-734 (S.F. Sup. Ct. 1981) – antitrust indirect-purchaser action on behalf of California consumers of wiring devices.
- (22) *In re: Concrete Antitrust Litigation*, MDL 296 – antitrust action for Arizona ready-mix purchasers.
- (23) *Marks v. San Francisco Real Estate Board*, Civil Action No. C-71-369-MHP – antitrust, class action on behalf of Bay Area class of home sellers who paid fixed real estate commission rates.
- (24) *Solvoil Company v. Lamplight Farms, Inc.*, Civil Action No. 755-503 (S.F. Sup. Ct.) – antitrust/fraud action by terminated distributor against manufacturer-supplier.
- (25) *THC Financial Litigation*, Civil No. 76-0448C (D. Ha.) – securities fraud class action brought on behalf of the depositors and holders of investment certificates and debentures in THC Financial Corporation.

- (26) *Buffalo Whole Food and Grain Co. v. The Fleming Companies, et al.*, Civil Action No. C-81-927-THE – nationwide antitrust, class action on behalf of purchasers of health foods.
- (27) *In re: Olympic Oil Securities Litigation*, Civil Action No. C-81-3441-RPA (N.D. Cal.) – 10b-5 action on behalf of defrauded shareholders.
- (28) *Prescottano v. Koracorp Industries, Inc.*, C-74-1704 (N.D. Cal.) – class of shareholders alleging securities fraud.
- (29) *Espirit de Corp. v. Alton Box Board Co., et al.*, Civil Action No. 750-975 (S.F. Sup. Ct. 1982) – state-wide, antitrust class action for indirect purchasers of corrugated boxes.
- (30) *Greenberg v. Leviton Manufacturing Co., Inc., et al.* (S.F. Sup. Ct. 1980) – state-wide class action for indirect purchases of wiring devices.
- (31) *Busy Boy Markets, Inc., et al. v. Roblin Industries, Inc., et al.*, Civil Action No. 772-241 – antitrust price-fixing case for class of indirect purchasers of shopping carts.
- (32) *U.F.C.W., Local 1288 v. Allied Finance Adjusters Conference*, Civil Action No. 777-670 (S.F. Sup. Ct.) – antitrust price-fixing action by California class against repossession firms.
- (33) *Retail Clerks Union, Local 648, et al. v. Exxon Corp., et al.*, MDL 150 – indirect purchaser, antitrust class action on behalf of California consumers of gasoline.
- (34) *In re: Airport Rent-A-Car Antitrust Litigation*, MDL 338 – antitrust action by independent car rental companies against major car rental companies; appeal pending before the Ninth Circuit.
- (35) *Tom Lazio Fish Co., Inc. v. Castle & Cooke, Inc., et al.* (S.F. Sup. Ct.) – antitrust, predatory pricing action brought by competitor against major tuna packers.
- (36) *In re: Records and Tapes Antitrust Litigation* (N.E. Ill. 1983) – nationwide, price-fixing, class action for direct purchasers of records and tapes.
- (37) *Alexander v. Cambridge-Lee Industries, Inc., et al.* (S.F. Sup. Ct. 1983) – indirect-purchaser, antitrust class action by California purchasers of copper tubing.
- (38) *B.W.I. Custom Kitchens v. Owens-Illinois, et al.* (S.F. Sup. Ct. 1983) – indirect-purchaser, antitrust class action by California wholesale purchasers of glass containers.
- (39) *Highland Park Liquor, Inc., et al. v. ARA Services, Inc., et al.* (L.A. Sup. Ct. 1983) – antitrust, price-fixing class action by wholesale purchasers of magazines.
- (40) *Biljac v. Bank of America, et al.* (S.F. Sup. Ct. 1984) – Unfair Competition Act case for antitrust price-fixing involving the prime rate to commercial borrowers.

- (41) *Biogenesis Research, Inc. v. The Hertz Corporation, et al.* (S.F. Sup. Ct. 1984) – Unfair Competition Act for fixing car-rental rates to California consumers.
- (42) *Alexander v. American Savings & Loan Association, et al.* (S.F. Sup. Ct. 1984) – Unfair Competition Act for fixing pre-payment and association fees.
- (43) *Tyre Treds, Inc. v. The Firestone Tire & Rubber Company*, Civil No. 70-236-SC (N.D. Cal. 1976) – distributor termination, antitrust action.
- (44) *Reno-West Coast Distributing Company, Inc. v. The Mead Corporation*, Civil Action No. 73-0250-SW (N.D. Cal. 1976) – distributor termination, antitrust action.
- (45) *Unique Factory Outlet v. Espirit de Corp.*, Civil No. C-78-2336-WTS (N.D. Cal. 1980) – distributor termination, antitrust action.
- (46) *California Indirect-Purchaser Infant Formula Antitrust Litigation*, Judicial Council Coordination Proceeding No. 2557 (L.A. Sup. Ct.) – state-wide, Cartwright Act, class action for consumers who purchased infant formula.
- (47) *Stead Industries, Inc. v. State Industries, Inc.* (N.D. Cal.) – Sherman 2 monopolization case involving water heater industry.
- (48) *Airport Hub Antitrust Litigation* (N.D. Ga.) – nationwide class action for price-fixing of domestic airline ticket prices.
- (49) *Duke Development Company v. The Stanley Works, et al.* (S.F. Sup. Ct.) – state-wide, price-fixing, Cartwright Act, class action for indirect purchasers of hinges.
- (50) *Exxon Valdez Spill Litigation* (L.A. Sup. Ct.) – state-wide class action for economic damages suffered by California motorists caused by Exxon Valdez spill.
- (51) *Dombek v. Humboldt Petroleum, Inc., et al.* (H.C. Sup. Ct.) – price-fixing, Cartwright Act class action for purchasers of petroleum products in Humboldt County.
- (52) *First Executive Life Insurance Litigation* (S.F. Sup. Ct.) – nationwide class of defrauded life insurance purchasers.
- (53) *Abbott v. Genentech, Inc.* (N.D. Cal.) – nationwide securities class action for security fraud violations.
- (54) *Abbott/Morse v. Nintendo of America, Inc.* (S.M. Sup. Ct.) – state-wide class action for unfair business practices in Cartwright Act violations.
- (55) *Los Angeles Waste Antitrust Litigation* (L.A. Sup. Ct.) – county-wide, price-fixing, Cartwright Act class action.
- (56) *In re: Macadamia Nuts Antitrust Litigation* (N.D. Cal.) – nationwide class action on behalf of direct purchasers of macadamia nuts for price-fixing.

- (57) *Weinberg/Friedman v. The B. Manischewitz Co.* (S.F. Sup. Ct.) – state-wide, Cartwright Act, price-fixing class action for indirect purchasers of matzo products.
- (58) *Movie 1 & 2 v. United Artists, et al.* (N.D. Cal.) – competitor case for alleged group boycott and monopolization.
- (59) *Wirebound Box Antitrust Litigation* (D. MN.) – nationwide class action for price-fixing of wirebound boxes.
- (60) *Orlando & Jones, Inc., et al. v. Nautilus Sports/Medical Industries, Inc., et al.* (D. FL.) – distributor claiming unfair business practices by manufacturer.
- (61) *James R. Benefiel and Edward D. Taylor v. Exxon Corporation, et al.* (L.A. Sup. Ct. 1989) – California class action for economic damages due to Exxon oil spill.
- (62) *Syufy Enterprises v. Vogel Popcorn Company, et al.*, File No. CV. 3-89-664, Master File No. 3-89-710 – class action involving bulk raw popcorn price-fixing case on behalf of direct purchasers.
- (63) *Renaissance Rialto, Inc., et al. v. Vogel Popcorn Company, et al.*, Civil No. 909-893 (S.F. Sup. Ct.) – class action involving bulk raw popcorn price-fixing case, on behalf of indirect purchasers.
- (64) *Arthur M. Stone Company and Tree of Life, Inc. v. Mauna Loa Macadamia Nut Corporation, et al.* - (N.D. Cal. 1990) – direct-purchaser, class action for price-fixing macadamia nuts.
- (65) *Gary Kaplan/Frank Holminski v. Southern Pacific Transportation Company, et al.*, Civil No. 935-732 (S.F. Sup. Ct.) – class action suit for damages due to toxic spill.
- (66) *John R. Travis v. Deloitte & Touche, et al.*, Civil No. 933-393 (S.F. Sup. Ct.) – class action suit representing persons who purchased life insurance products, who were damaged by fraudulent investments.
- (67) *In re: Potash Antitrust Litigation*, Civil File No. 3-93-197, MDL 981, U.S. District Court, District of Minnesota, Third Division – class action suit on behalf of direct purchasers of potash alleging horizontal price-fixing.
- (68) *Neve Brothers v. Potash Corporation of America, et al.*, Civil Case No. 959-767 (S.F. Sup. Ct.) – indirect-purchaser antitrust class action for potash purchasers.
- (69) *Diane Barela, et al. v. Ralph's Grocery Company, et al.*, Civil Case No. BC070061 (L.A. Sup. Ct.) – consumer class action alleging a milk price-fixing conspiracy in Los Angeles County.
- (70) *In re: Baby Food Antitrust Litigation*, Master File No. 92-5495 (NHP), United States District Court for the District of New Jersey – class action of direct purchasers against baby food manufacturers.

- (71) *Leslie K. Bruce, et al. v. Gerber Products Company, et al.*, Civil Case No. 948-857 (S.F. Sup. Ct.) – indirect-purchaser, price-fixing action against baby food manufacturers.
- (72) *Mark Notz, et al. v. Ticketmaster-Southern California, Inc., et al.*, Civil Case No. 943-327 (S.F. Sup. Ct.) – consumer class action alleging a territorial allocation in violation of the Cartwright Act.
- (73) *Nancy Wolf v. Toyota Motor Sales, U.S.A., Inc., et al.*, Civil Action No. C94-1359-MHP – nationwide, consumer class action alleging that the TDA Assessment on the dealer invoice was raised pursuant to an antitrust agreement.
- (74) *Lee Bright v. Kanzaki Specialty Papers, Inc., et al.*, Civil Action No. 963-598 (S.F. Sup. Ct.) – indirect-purchaser, consumer class action alleging a price-fixing conspiracy on fax paper.
- (75) *In re: Media Vision Technology Securities Litigation*, Civil Action No. C-94-1015-EFL (U.S. District Court - Northern District of CA) – securities fraud class action.
- (76) *Tortola Restaurants, L.P. v. Comet Products, Inc., et al.*, Civil Action No. 961-814 (S.F. Super Ct.) – indirect-purchaser, class action alleging a price-fixing conspiracy on plastic dinnerware.
- (77) *In re: California X-Ray Antitrust Litigation*, Civil Action No. 960-886 (S.F. Sup. Ct.) – indirect-purchaser, class action alleging price-fixing in X-ray film.
- (78) *Dianne Castano, et al. v. The American Tobacco Company, et al.*, Civil Action No. 94-1044, Section "S"(5) (U.S. District Court - Eastern District of Louisiana) – class action alleging that the tobacco companies formulated cigarettes to addict consumers.
- (79) *In re: Brand Name Prescription Drugs Antitrust Litigation*, Civil Action No. 94-C-897, MDL 997 (U.S. District Court - Northern District of Illinois, Eastern Division) – direct-purchaser class action alleging that the prescription drug manufacturers and wholesalers combined to keep prices unreasonably high to retail pharmacies.
- (80) *Pharmaceutical Cases I, II and III*, Judicial Council Proceeding Nos. 2969, 2971, 2972 (S.F. Sup. Ct.) – indirect-purchaser, consumer class action alleging that prescription drug manufacturers and wholesalers kept prices unreasonably high to retail pharmacies who passed on the overcharges to consumers.
- (81) *In re: Carbon Dioxide Antitrust Litigation*, MDL 940, United States District Court, Middle District of Florida, Orlando Division – direct purchaser class action alleging price-fixing on carbon dioxide.
- (82) *In re: Liquid Carbon Dioxide Cases*, Judicial Council Coordination Proceeding No. 3012 (San Diego Sup. Ct.) – indirect-purchaser class action alleging price-fixing on carbon dioxide.

- (83) *Jack Davis v. Microsoft Corporation*, Civil Action No. 963597 (S.F. Sup. Ct.) – consumer class action alleging that Microsoft's 6.0 system was flawed and should be corrected.
- (84) *In re: Airline Ticket Commission Antitrust Litigation*, MDL 1058 (Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation) – class action alleging that the airlines conspired to fix travel agents' commission rates.
- (85) *Cosmetics Antitrust Litigation*; JCCP No. 4056 – class action alleging that manufacturers of prestige cosmetics and retail department stores conspired to prevent discounting of cosmetics.
- (86) *In re: Sorbate Price-Fixing Cases*; JCCP 4073 – class action alleging that certain manufacturers of sorbate fixed prices for product sold indirectly to California.
- (87) *In re: Methionine Antitrust Litigation*, MDL 1311 – class action alleging that certain manufacturers of methionine fixed prices to direct purchasers throughout the United States.
- (88) *In re: Methionine Cases*, JCCP 4090 – class action alleging that certain manufacturers of methionine fixed prices to indirect purchasers of that product in California
- (89) *Gaehwiler, Sr., et al. v. Sunrise Carpet Industries, et al.*, SF Sup. Ct. Action No. 978345 – class action alleging that manufacturers of certain types of carpets fixed prices to indirect purchasers in California.
- (90) *Chrysler Paint Cases*; JCCP 4038 – nationwide class action alleging defect in Chrysler paint.
- (91) *Sanitary Paper Cases I & II*, JCCP 4019, 4027 – class action alleging that manufacturers of certain types of sanitary paper fixed prices to indirect purchasers in California.
- (92) *In re: Dura Lube Corporation Fraud Actions*, SF Sup. Ct. Action No. 304186 – class action alleging certain practices and false advertising by Dura Lube.
- (93) *In re: Flat Glass Indirect Purchaser Antitrust Litigation*, JCCP 4033 – class action alleging that manufacturers of certain types of flat glass fixed prices to indirect purchasers in California.
- (94) *Verges, et al. v. Old Republic Title Co.*, SF Sup. Ct. Action No. 996929 – statewide class action alleging fraudulent schemes by title insurance companies.
- (95) *In re: Toys R Us Antitrust Litigation*, MDL 1211 – nationwide class action alleging anticompetitive activities in the children's toy market.
- (96) *NASDAQ Market Makers Antitrust Litigation*, MDL 1023 94 Civ. 3996 (RWS) – nationwide class action alleging that commissions were illegally fixed.



- (97) *In re: Vitamin Antitrust Litigation*, JCCP 4076 – statewide class action by indirect purchasers alleging a price-fixing conspiracy.
- (98) *Sanders v. Great Spring Water of America d/b/a Calistoga Mineral Water Co. and d/b/a Arrowhead Mountain Spring Water Co., et al*, S.F. Sup. Ct. 303549 – nationwide class action alleging deceptive advertising in the sale of so-called “spring water.”
- (99) *In re: Providian Credit Card Litigation*, JCCP 4085 – a consumer fraud class action alleging a credit card company imposes fraudulent fees on its customers.
- (100) *GM Car Paint Cases*; JCCP 4070 – nationwide class action alleging defect in GM paint.
- (101) *Lopez v. Nissan North America, Inc.*, S.F. Sup. Ct. Action No. 305810 – nationwide class action alleging defect in Nissan paint.
- (102) *Judy v. Ford Motor Company*, S.F. Sup. Ct. Action No. 305722 – nationwide class action alleging defect in Ford paint.
- (103) *In re: Auctions House Antitrust Litigation*, JCCP 4145 – indirect-purchaser antitrust class action alleging that major auction houses fixed buyer commissions.
- (104) *In re: Microsoft I-V Cases*; JCCP 4106 – California Cartwright Act class action on behalf of all natural persons and businesses that purchased Microsoft operating systems and applications.
- (105) *In re: Cigarette Price-Fixing Cases*, JCCP 4114 – California Cartwright Act class action alleging that the tobacco companies fixed prices of cigarettes to pay state settlements.
- (106) *Weyerhaeuser Siding Cases*, S.F. Sup. Ct. Action No. 995787 – nationwide class action alleging that home siding was defective.
- (107) *In re: Carbon Fiber Cases I, II, and III*, JCCP 4212, 4216, and 4222 – statewide class action by indirect purchasers alleging a price-fixing conspiracy.
- (108) *In re: Microcrystalline Celluloid (MCC) Cases I, II, and III*, JCCP 4173, 4178 and 4181 – statewide class action by indirect purchasers alleging a price-fixing conspiracy.
- (109) *In re: Methionine Cases and Methionine Cases II*, JCCP 4090 and 4096 – statewide class action by indirect purchasers alleging a price-fixing conspiracy.
- (110) *Cintas Technologies, Inc., v. ISK Magnetics, et al.*, S.F. Sup. Ct. Action No. 323321 – statewide class action by indirect purchasers alleging a price-fixing conspiracy.
- (111) *In re: Carbon Black Cases*, JCCP 4323 – statewide class action by indirect purchasers alleging a price-fixing conspiracy.
- (112) *Sullivan, et al. v. DB Investments, Inc., et al.*, USDC, NDNJ No. 3:04- cv-02819 – nationwide class action by direct purchasers alleging a price-fixing conspiracy.

- (113) *DRAM Cases*, JCCP 4265 – statewide class action by indirect purchasers alleging a price-fixing conspiracy.
- (114) *Automobile Antitrust Cases I, II*, JCCP 4298 and 4303 – statewide class action by indirect purchasers alleging a price-fixing conspiracy.
- (115) *In re: Natural Gas Anti-Trust Cases I, II, III & IV*, JCCP 4221, 4224, 4226 and 4228 – statewide class action by indirect purchasers alleging a price-fixing conspiracy.
- (116) *In re: Laminate Cases*, JCCP 4129 – statewide class action by indirect purchasers alleging a price-fixing conspiracy.
- (117) *In re: Lupron Drug Cases*, JCCP 4238 – statewide class action by indirect purchasers alleging a price-fixing conspiracy.
- (118) *Alameda Drug Co., et al. v. Medco Health Solutions, Inc., et al.*, S.F. Sup. Ct. Action No. CGC-04-428109 – statewide class action by indirect purchasers alleging a price-fixing conspiracy.
- (119) *Polyester Staple Cases*, JCCP 4278 – statewide class action by indirect purchasers alleging a price-fixing conspiracy.
- (120) *Food Additives (HFCS) Cases*, JCCP 3261 – statewide class action by indirect purchasers alleging a price-fixing conspiracy.
- (121) *In re: Insurance Brokerage Antitrust Litigation*, MDL 1663 – nationwide class action by direct purchasers alleging a price-fixing conspiracy.
- (122) *Schreiner and Gustin, Inc. v. Crompton Corporation, et al.*, Sup. Ct. Action No. CGC-04-429323 – statewide class action by indirect purchasers alleging a price-fixing conspiracy.
- (123) *Leola Loots v. Crompton Corp., et al.*, Sup. Ct. Action No. CGC-04-431247 – statewide class action by indirect purchasers alleging a price-fixing conspiracy.
- (124) *Kim, et al. v. SONY Computer Entertainment, America, Inc.*, Sup. Ct. Action No. CIV 427336 – statewide class action by indirect purchasers alleging a price-fixing conspiracy.
- (125) *Schneider v. Autobahn Motors, et al.*, Sup. Ct. Action No. 315111 – statewide class action by indirect purchasers alleging a price-fixing conspiracy.
- (126) *Sullivan v. Union Oil Company of California*, Dist. Ct. Action No. 04-5236 – nationwide class action by direct purchasers alleging a price-fixing conspiracy.
- (127) *In re: Intel Corporation Microprocessor Antitrust Litigation*, MDL 1717 – nationwide class action by purchasers of computers with Intel systems.
- (128) *In re: TFT-LCD (Flat Panel) Antitrust Litigation*, MDL 1827 – indirect-purchaser class action for LCD price-fixing.



- (129) *In re: Static Random Access Memory (SRAM) Antitrust Litigation*, MDL 1819 – indirect-purchaser class action for SRAM price-fixing.
- (130) *In re: Optical Disk Drive (ODD) Antitrust Litigation*, MDL 2143 – indirect-purchaser class action for ODD price-fixing.
- (131) *In re: Flash Memory Antitrust Litigation*, MDL 1852 – indirect-purchaser class action for Flash price-fixing.
- (132) *In re: Cathode Ray Tube (CRT) Antitrust Litigation*, MDL 1917 – indirect-purchaser class action for CRT price-fixing.
- (133) *In re: Lithium Ion Batteries Antitrust Litigation*, MDL 2420 – indirect-purchaser class action for LIB price-fixing.
- (134) *In re: Automotive Parts Antitrust Litigation*, MDL 2311 – class action for automotive parts price-fixing.
- (135) *Automotive Parts Cases – Wire Harness*, Dist. Ct. Action No. 12-00100 – class action for wire harness price-fixing.
- (136) *Automotive Parts Cases – Instrument Panel Clusters*, Dist. Ct. Action No. 12-00200 – class action for instrument panel clusters price-fixing.
- (137) *Automotive Parts Cases – Fuel Senders*, Dist. Ct. Action No. 12-00300 – class action for fuel senders price-fixing.
- (138) *Automotive Parts Cases – Heater Control Panels*, Dist. Ct. Action No. 12-00400 – class action for heater control panels price-fixing.
- (139) *Automotive Parts Cases – Bearings*, Dist. Ct. Action No. 12-00500 – class action for wire harness price-fixing.
- (140) *Automotive Parts Cases – Occupant Safety Systems*, Dist. Ct. Action No. 12-00600 – class action for occupant safety systems price-fixing.
- (141) *Automotive Parts Cases – Alternators*, Dist. Ct. Action No. 13-00700 – class action for alternators price-fixing.
- (142) *Automotive Parts Cases – Anti-Vibrational Rubber Parts*, Dist. Ct. Action No. 13-00800 – class action for anti-vibrational rubber parts price-fixing.
- (143) *Automotive Parts Cases – Windshield Wipers*, Dist. Ct. Action No. 13-00900 – class action for windshield wipers price-fixing.
- (144) *Automotive Parts Cases – Radiators*, Dist. Ct. Action No. 13-01000 – class action for radiators price-fixing.

- (145) *Automotive Parts Cases – Starters*, Dist. Ct. Action No. 13-01100 – class action for starters price-fixing.
- (146) *Automotive Parts Cases – Automotive Lamps*, Dist. Ct. Action No. 13-01200 – class action for automotive lamps price-fixing.
- (147) *Automotive Parts Cases – Switches*, Dist. Ct. Action No. 13-01300 – class action for switches price-fixing.
- (148) *Automotive Parts Cases – Ignition Coils*, Dist. Ct. Action No. 13-01400 – class action for ignition coils price-fixing.
- (149) *Automotive Parts Cases – Motor Generator*, Dist. Ct. Action No. 13-01500 – class action for motor generator price-fixing.
- (150) *Automotive Parts Cases – Steering Angle Sensors*, Dist. Ct. Action No. 13-01600 – class action for steering angle sensors price-fixing.
- (151) *Automotive Parts Cases – HID Ballasts*, Dist. Ct. Action No. 13-01700 – class action for HID ballasts price-fixing.
- (152) *Automotive Parts Cases – Inverters*, Dist. Ct. Action No. 13-01800 – class action for inverters price-fixing.
- (153) *Automotive Parts Cases – Electronic Powered Steering Assemblies*, Dist. Ct. Action No. 13-01900 – class action for electronic powered steering assemblies price-fixing.
- (154) *Automotive Parts Cases – Air Flow Meters*, Dist. Ct. Action No. 13-02000 – class action for air flow meters price-fixing.
- (155) *Automotive Parts Cases – Fan Motors*, Dist. Ct. Action No. 13-02100 – class action for fan motors price-fixing.
- (156) *Automotive Parts Cases – Fuel Injection Systems*, Dist. Ct. Action No. 13-02200 – class action for fuel injection systems price-fixing.
- (157) *Automotive Parts Cases – Power Window Motors*, Dist. Ct. Action No. 13-02300 – class action for power window motors price-fixing.
- (158) *Automotive Parts Cases – Automatic Transmission Fluid Warmers*, Dist. Ct. Action No. 13-02400 – class action for automatic transmission fluid warmers price-fixing.
- (159) *Automotive Parts Cases – Valve Timing Control Devices*, Dist. Ct. Action No. 13-02500 – class action for valve timing control devices price-fixing.
- (160) *Automotive Parts Cases – Electronic Throttle Bodies*, Dist. Ct. Action No. 13-02600 – class action for electronic throttle bodies price-fixing.

- (161) *Automotive Parts Cases – Air Conditioning Systems*, Dist. Ct. Action No. 13-02700 – class action for air conditioning systems price-fixing.
- (162) *Automotive Parts Cases – Windshield Washer Systems*, Dist. Ct. Action No. 13-02800 – class action for windshield washer systems price-fixing.
- (163) *Automotive Parts Cases – Automotive Constant Velocity Joint Boot Products*, Dist. Ct. Action No. 14-02900 – class action for automotive constant velocity joint boot products price-fixing.
- (164) *In re: Vehicle Carrier Services Antitrust Litigation*, MDL 2471 – indirect-purchaser class action for vehicle carrier services price-fixing.
- (165) *In re: Cast Iron Soil Pipe Antitrust Litigation*, MDL 2508 – indirect-purchaser class action for cast iron soil pipe price-fixing.
- (166) *Pierce-Nunes v. Toshiba America Information Systems, Inc.*, Dist. Ct. Action No. 14-00796 – class action for intentionally mislabeling LCD televisions as LED televisions.
- (167) *Wheitz v. Vizio, Inc.*, Sup. Ct. Action No. CGC-14-537610 – class action for intentionally mislabeling LCD televisions as LED televisions.
- (168) *Rabinowitz v. Samsung Electronics America, Inc.*, Dist. Ct. Action No. 14-00801 – class action for intentionally mislabeling LCD televisions as LED televisions.
- (169) *Ferrari v. Best Buy Co., Inc. et al.*, Dist. Ct. Action No. 14-02956 – class action for intentionally mislabeling LCD televisions as LED televisions.
- (170) *Popejoy et al v. Sharp Electronics Corporation*, Dist. Ct. Action No. 14-03495 – class action for intentionally mislabeling LCD televisions as LED televisions.
- (171) *Four in One Company, Inc. v. SK Foods, L.P. et al.*, Dist. Ct. Action No. 08-03017 – direct-purchaser class action for tomatoes price-fixing.
- (172) *In re: Processed Egg Products Antitrust Litigation*, MDL 2002 – class action for processed egg products price-fixing.
- (173) *In re: Aftermarket Automotive Lighting Products Antitrust Litigation*, MDL 2007 – indirect-purchaser class action for aftermarket automotive lighting products price-fixing.
- (174) *In re: Transpacific Passenger Air Transportation Antitrust Litigation*, MDL 1913 – indirect-purchaser class action for transpacific passenger air transportation price-fixing.